# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/712,544 | 11/13/2003 | Scott Carrier | RSW9-2003-00233US1 (7161- | 9171 |

| 7590 | 05/31/2006 |
|---|---|

Steven M. Greenberg, Esquire
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
Suite 2040
200 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL  33301

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BOTTS, MICHAEL K |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _13 March 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.     2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This document is a Final Office Action on the merits.   This action is responsive

to the following communications:  Response to Office Action, which was filed on March

13, 2006.

2.      Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the case, with claims 1, 6, 10, and 11 being

the independent claims.  Claim 1 is amended.

3.      Claims 1-14 are rejected.


### *Claims Objections, Minor Informalities*

4.      **Claims 1-14** are objected to because of the following informalities, regarding

inconsistent terminology and terminology requiring interpretation or definition by the

Examiner:

The term "field validation pattern" is not defined in the specification.  The closest

term is "pattern validation" which refers to the inspection of user input to ensure that the

input conforms to a particular pattern, such as date formats, time formats, telephone

number formats, etc.  See, disclosure, paragraph [0003].  Upon examination of the

claims and the specification, it is the Examiner's belief that Applicant intended the term

"filed validation pattern" to refer to "pattern validation" within the entry field of a form for

purposes of checking input format for dates, time, telephone numbers, etc., and the

term will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

The term "validation script library" is defined in the specification by its use only, which is read by the Examiner, based on a review of the claims and specification, as a client side input validator, and will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

The term "disposed within markup" is not defined in the specification. It is the belief of the Examiner, based on a review of the claims and specification, that the Applicant intended to the term to mean that the invention used a markup computer language, and the term will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

The term "validation shell function" is not defined in the specification. The term "shell," as used in the software arts, was known to one of ordinary skill in the art as "a program that interprets sequences of text input as commands." See, IEEE 100, The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition, IEEE Press,2000, definition of "shell." Accordingly, based on a review of the claims and specification, the term "validation shell function" is read as a user interface to enter the data into the form, which is read as inherent in a form filling and validation program, and the phrase will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

The term "pattern validation routine" is not defined in the specification. Upon examination of the claims and the specification, it is the Examiner's belief that the Applicant intended the term to be the comparison of input with valid input patterns within the validation routine, and will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

Appropriate correction is required.

### Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scholz, et al.

(U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0078949, filed April 30, 2001 and published

April 24, 2003) [hereinafter "Scholz"]. In general, it is noted that the claimed invention is

generally a client-side validation program to check data entries to a form to ensure the

data is of a correct type. In general, such form data validators were well known in the

art at the time of the invention. Scholz teaches a client-side validator for data entry to a

form. See generally, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching "Input Validation" to a

form. Scholz does not use Applicant's terminology, but clearly teaches all functional

elements specified by the Applicant.

Regarding **independent claim 1, as amended**, Scholz teaches:

*A lightweight pattern validation system comprising:*

> *a validation processor configured with a prototype interface for receiving*
>
> *both a field validation pattern and also form based input to be validated against*
>
> *said field validation pattern; and,*
>
> *a validation script library packaging said validation processor.*

(It is noted that the term "prototype" is read as merely non-functional descriptive

language describing the interface as a working model. See, The American Heritage

College Dictionary, Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin, 2002, definition of "prototype."

See, Scholz, paragraph [0116], teaching a "form processor" as a separate

component or module. See also, Scholz, paragraph [0131], teaching the custom tags,

for the validation, implemented as an object model stored in the tag library.

See generally, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching "Input Validation" to a

form. Specifically, see, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0013], teaching the overview of the

validator.)


Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Scholz teaches:

> *The system of claim 1, further comprising:*
>
> *a library reference to said script library disposed within markup defining a*
>
> *form having at least one form based input field programmed for validation using*
>
> *said validation processor; and,*
>
> *a function call to said validation processor further disposed in said*
>
> *markup, said function call having a configuration for passing a reference to a*

*value in said at least one form based input field for validation in said validation*

*processor.*

(It is noted that based on a review of the claims and the specification, the limitation of a

"library reference to said script library disposed within markup" is read as a system,

including computer code, within a markup language wherein entry to a form is validated

by the processor, and will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action. Further,

claim 2 is read as limiting the function call to validate as passing the value by reference,

and will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

See, Scholz, paragraph [0109], teaching validation by reference to the validation

code. And see, Scholz, paragraphs [0131]-[0132], teaching the custom tag library and

the FormCollection object. See, Scholz, paragraph [0092], teaching the use of a

markup language.)


Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Scholz teaches:

> *The system of claim 2, further comprising a plurality of additional function*
>
> *calls to said validation processor disposed in said markup, each additional one of*
>
> *said functional calls having a configuration for passing a reference to a value in a*
>
> *corresponding form based input field for validation in said validation processor.*

(It is noted that the limitation of "a plurality of additional function calls to said validation

processor disposed in said markup" is read by the Examiner as merely repeating the

passing by reference validation claimed in dependent claim 3, and will be so read for

the remainder of this Office Action.

See, Scholz, paragraph [0147], teaching multiple tags and, inherently, multiple function calls to those tags.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Scholz teaches:

> *The system of claim 2, further comprising a validation shell function*
>
> *encapsulating said function call.*

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0131], teaching the FormCollection library and functions calls contained therein.]

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Scholz teaches:

> *The system of claim 3, further comprising a validation shell function*
>
> *encapsulating said function call.*

(See, Scholz, paragraph 0131, teaching the tag library containing the FormCollection of function calls.)

Regarding **independent claim 6**, Scholz teaches:

> *A pattern validation method comprising the steps of:*
>
> *retrieving a value for a form based input field from a form defined in*
>
> *markup rendered in a content browser;*
>
> *passing said retrieved value along with a validation pattern for said form*
>
> *based input field to a validation process disposed within a lightweight validation*
>
> *library coupled to said rendered markup; and,*

> *validating said retrieved value according to said validation pattern in said*
>
> *content browser.*

(It is noted that the term "lightweight" is read as merely non-functional descriptive language and is not given weight as a patent limitation.

See, Scholz, paragraph [0116], teaching a "form processor" as a separate component or module.

See, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching retrieving input, passing the input value, and validating the retrieved value according to a valuation pattern within the content browser. Specifically, see Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language, HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.)


Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Scholz teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of repeating said*
>
> *retrieving, passing and validating steps for at least one additional value for at*
>
> *least one additional form based input field disposed in said markup rendered in*
>
> *said content browser.*

(It is noted that claim 7 is read by the Examiner as merely repeating the steps claimed in dependent claim 6, and will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

See, Scholz, paragraph [0147], teaching multiple tags and, inherently, multiple function calls to those tags.)


Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Scholz teaches:

> *The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of performing said*
>
> *retrieving, passing, and validating steps in a validation shell function disposed in*
>
> *said markup rendered in said content browser.*

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language, HTML

and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.)


Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Scholz teaches:

> *The method of claim 7, further comprising the step of performing said*
>
> *retrieving, passing, validating and repeating steps in a validation shell function*
>
> *disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.*

(It is noted that the claim is read as merely repeating the interaction through the

inherent interface to repeat the method steps specified in claim 7.

See, Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language,

HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.)


Regarding **independent claim 10**, Scholz teaches:

> *A pattern validation method comprising the steps of:*
>
> *defining a pattern validation routine to validate form based input provided*
>
> *through a prototype interface to said routine based upon a validation pattern also*
>
> *provided through said prototype interface;*
>
> *packaging said pattern validation routine into a lightweight validation script*
>
> *library;*

*referencing said lightweight validation script library in markup disposed*

*within a content server configured to distribute said markup to requesting clients;*

*defining at least one form based input field in said markup and further*

*defining a validation pattern for each of said at least one form based input fields;*

*and,*

*for each form based input field and defined validation pattern, disposing a*

*function call to said pattern validation routine in said lightweight script library.*

(See, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching retrieving input, passing the input

value, and validating the retrieved value according to a valuation pattern within the

content browser. Specifically, see Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with

a markup language, HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.

See also, Scholz, paragraph 0116, teaching the separate validating component

or module.

See also, Scholz, paragraph [0174], teaching that the code could alternatively be

executed at a server.

See also, Scholz, paragraphs [0131]-[0132], teaching a custom tag library and

FormCollection object, with function calls.)


Regarding **independent claim 11**, Scholz teaches:

*A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program*

*for pattern validation, the computer program comprising a routine set of*

*instructions which when executed by the machine cause the machine to perform
the steps of:*

> *retrieving a value for a form based input field from a form defined in
markup rendered in a content browser;*

> *passing said retrieved value along with a validation pattern for said form
based input field to a validation process disposed within a lightweight validation
library coupled to said rendered markup; and,*

> *validating said retrieved value according to said validation pattern in said
content browser.*

(Claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and, in
further consideration of the following, is rejected along the same rationale. The
Examiner takes official notice of the fact that that method steps that are performed by a
compute are stored on computer or machine readable storage. It would have been
obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store the claimed
method steps on computer readable storage for purposes of archiving, sale,
transportation, etc.)


Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Scholz teaches:

> *The machine readable storage of claim 11, further comprising the step of
repeating said retrieving, passing and validating steps for at least one additional
value for at least one additional form based input field disposed in said markup
rendered in said content browser.*

(It is noted that the claim is read as merely repeating the method steps specified in claim 11.

Claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, Scholz teaches:

> *The machine readable storage of claim 11, further comprising the step of performing said retrieving, passing, and validating steps in a validation shell function disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.*

(Claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 14**, Scholz teaches:

> *The machine readable storage of claim 12, further comprising the step of performing said retrieving, passing, validating and repeating steps in a validation shell function disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.*

(It is noted that the claim is read as merely repeating the method steps specified in claim 12.

Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

5.      It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to

be limiting in any way.  A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.


6.      It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the

prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to

be limiting in any way.  A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.


### *Response to Arguments*

Applicants' arguments filed March 13, 2006 have been fully considered, but they

are not persuasive.


Regarding rejections of **claims 1-14** under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Applicant argues that the grounds for rejection were not expressly disclosed.

See, Amendment, pages 6 and 7.

The Examiner disagrees.

As noted above, Applicant's invention is a client-side form input validator such as

was well known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, and was

clearly taught in Scholz.


Regarding **independent claim 1**:

Applicant argues that the rejection was ambiguous as to what particular features in Scholz alleged disclose the particular features recited in the claims.

The Examiner disagrees.

Applicant claims a validation processor, a prototype interface, a field validation pattern, a form input, a validation script library, and all the interactions in between.

See, Scholz, paragraph in general teaching the validation processor with the claimed functions and functionality. See generally, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching "Input Validation" to a form, specifically paragraph [0092].


Regarding **dependent claim 2**:

First: Applicant argues that the rejection was ambiguous as to what particular features in Scholz alleged disclose the particular features recited in the claims.

The Examiner disagrees.

Although the application uses different terminology than the reference, one of ordinary skill in the art would be able to read the cited reference to understand the teaching as applied to the claim. In consideration of Applicant's demand for more specificity, the rejection of claim 2, above, has been expanded to more clearly identify to the Applicant the elements of the claim that are taught by the reference.

Second: Applicant argues that Scholz does not teach or suggest "a function call to said validation process further disposed in said markup, said function call having a configuration for passing a reference to a value in said at least one form based input field for validation in said validation processor." See, Amendment, page 11.

The Examiner disagrees.

The claim limitations simply require that the input data be passed by reference to the validation processor, and that the function passing the input be in a markup computer language.

It is inherent in a form data input validator that the input data be passed to the validator. See, Scholz, paragraph [0092], teaching the use of a markup language. See, Scholz, paragraph [0109], teaching passing by reference. It was well known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use functions in computer code. See, Scholz, paragraphs [0108]-[0115], figure 7, and Table 3, lines 86-87, teaching validation using a function.

Regarding **dependent claim 3**:

Applicant argues that Scholz does not teach a function call to a validation processor.

The Examiner disagrees.

It was well known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use functions in computer code. See, Scholz, paragraphs [0108]-[0115], figure 7, and Table 3, lines 86-87, teaching validation using a function.

Regarding **dependent claims 4 and 5**:

Applicant argues that Scholz does not teach a validation shell function.

The Examiner disagrees.

As noted above, It was well known by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use functions in computer code. See, Scholz, paragraphs [0108]-[0115], figure 7, and Table 3, lines 86-87, teaching validation using a function. As noted above, the term "validation shell function" is not defined in the specification. The term "shell," as used in the software arts, was known to one of ordinary skill in the art as "a program that interprets sequences of text input as commands." See, IEEE 100, The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, Seventh Edition, IEEE Press, 2000, definition of "shell." Accordingly, based on a review of the claims and specification, the term "validation shell function" is read as a user interface to enter the data into the form, which is read as inherent in a form filling and validation program, and the phrase will be so read for the remainder of this Office Action.

Accordingly, a "validation shell function" is taught by Scholz. See, Scholz, paragraphs [0108]-[0115], figure 7, and Table 3, lines 86-87, teaching validation using a function.

Regarding **dependent claims 6, 10, and 11**:

Applicant argues that Scholz does not teach a separate form validation process.

The Examiner disagrees.

See, Scholz, paragraph [0116], teaching a "form processor" as a separate component or module.

## Conclusion

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**  Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS for the mailing date of this action.  In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.  In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K.  Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533.  The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136.  The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb

**DOUG HUTTON**
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**
**TECH CENTER 2100**